



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2024 by E Street BSc (Hons)

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/24/3346356

77 Anglesmede Crescent, Harrow HA5 5ST

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by K Vaghela against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0214/24.
 - The development proposed is described as "conversion of the garage and utility room to office space, first floor side and rear extension and loft conversion".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. I have taken the above description from the application form albeit taken into account that the scheme in totality comprises a front porch, a two-storey side and rear extension, single storey rear extension, alterations to the roof and a rear dormer with a Juliet balcony. The Council do not object to the porch, the two-storey rear element or the dormer with balcony. I have no reason to disagree with their conclusions. My recommendation thus focusses on the two-storey side extension and, specifically its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is a detached dwelling which appears to be largely unaltered. The unit is defined by the spacing between the detached dwellings along with the standardised roof form which are a key positive feature. The wider street scene is defined by both semi-detached and detached dwellings in which there are various levels of spacing along with subservient side extensions. Nevertheless, the gaps lend a pleasant sense of spaciousness to the street scene which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. Whilst is set back from the front elevation, the side extension is to abut the neighbouring property of No.79 Anglesmede Crescent. The lack of set in of the proposal on the first floor would result in partially closing the natural gap

between the properties. This would lead to an extension which is viewed as dominating and oppressive. Whilst there would be a gap remaining, it would be substantially smaller than most in the wider street scene and would reduce the feel of openness. There are some instances of even smaller gaps in the locality, however, these are few and far between and are not the defining character of the area. The resultant flat roof by design is to be minimal and modest and whilst it would differ from the overriding number of small mono pitched roofs, it would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Overall, the side extension would not make a positive contribution to this dwelling and would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area by virtue of the above.

6. The proposal would thus conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policy CS.1B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM1 of the Development Management Plan Local Policies 2013, the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (the Framework) which together seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Other Matters

7. Photographs of other examples of similar development in other locations have been provided by the appellant. I am, however, unaware of their planning status and the finer details such as the circumstances which prevailed at the time or matters taken into account. They do not result in a sufficiently significant material consideration which would lead me to recommending the appeal be allowed.
8. There are also matters of assessment on which the appeal scheme would be acceptable, such as certain aspects of the Framework or in terms of the living conditions of neighbours to name two. These would however, in each case, be a lack of harm which would be neutral matters and not specifically weigh in favour of the proposed development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan. This is a matter to which I attach substantial weight. I have been given no other sufficiently compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR